



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,084	06/20/2003	James A. Amos	72255/30267	9008

7590 10/19/2006

Larry B. Donovan
1100 Huntington Building
925 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44115-1495

EXAMINER

LU, ZHIYU

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2618

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/600,084		AMOS, JAMES A.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Zhiyu Lu		2618	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities:

On line 11 of page 20, remove ",", between "comprises" and "a wireless" to correct grammatical error.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 6 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 6 recites the limitation "the at least one access point" in line 7 of page 21. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 22 recites the limitation "the base" in line 6 of page 24. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rusch (US2003/0100308).

Regarding claim 24, Rusch anticipates a method for a wireless handset to communicate to a local area network, the wireless handset suitably adapted to communicate with a corresponding base station, the base station being connected to the local area network (paragraph 0010), the steps comprising:

- a) establishing a connection with the base station via a first transceiver when the wireless handset is within range of the base station (abstract); and
- b) switching to a second transceiver and connecting to the local area network via the second transceiver when the wireless handset is outside the range of the base station (paragraphs 0003-0004, 0015-0017).

Regarding claim 25, Rusch anticipates the limitation of claim 24.

Rusch also anticipates the limitation of the second transceiver (802.11x) is a higher powered transceiver than the first transceiver (Bluetooth) (paragraph 0010).

Regarding claim 26, Rusch anticipates the limitation of claim 24.

Rusch also anticipates the limitation of the first transceiver is a Bluetooth compatible transceiver (Fig. 1, paragraph 0010).

Regarding claim 27, Rusch anticipates the limitation of claim 26.

Rusch also anticipates the limitation of the second transceiver is an 802.11 compatible transceiver (Fig. 1, paragraph 0010).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2, 4, 7, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tan et al. (US2004/0204084) in view of Rusch (US2003/0100308).

Regarding claim 1, Tan et al. teach a wireless voice over Internet Protocol telephone (abstract, Fig. 1)

But, Tan et al. fail to teach the limitation of comprising:

a) a wireless handset that comprises a wireless personal area network transceiver, a wireless local area network transceiver, and a selecting device;

b) wherein the selecting device selects the wireless personal area network transceiver when the wireless personal area network transceiver detects a wireless personal area network connection, otherwise the selecting device selects the wireless local area network transceiver.

Rusch teaches a wireless communication device (100 of Fig. 1) comprising:

- a) a wireless handset that comprises a wireless personal area network transceiver (Bluetooth, 108 of Fig. 1), a wireless local area network transceiver (802.11x, 106 of Fig. 1), and a selecting device (112 of Fig. 1);
- b) wherein the selecting device selects the wireless personal area network transceiver when the wireless personal area network transceiver detects a wireless personal area network connection, otherwise the selecting device selects the wireless local area network transceiver (abstract, paragraphs 0003-0004 and 0010).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate having more than one transceiver and a selecting device taught by Rusch into the wireless VOIP telephone of Tan et al., in order to pick up network connection easily.

Regarding claim 2, Tan et al. and Rusch teach the limitation of claim 1.

Tan et al. also teach the limitation of further comprising a base station (100 of Fig. 1) that comprises a wireless personal area network transceiver (200 of Fig. 1) for communicating with the wireless personal area network transceiver of the wireless handset (300 of Fig. 1) (paragraph 0021).

Regarding claims 4 and 9, Tan et al. and Rusch teach the limitations of claims 2 and 1.

Tan et al. teach the limitation of the wireless personal area network transceiver of the base station is a Bluetooth transceiver and the wireless personal area network transceiver of the wireless handset is a Bluetooth transceiver (paragraph 0021).

Regarding claim 7, Tan et al. and Rusch teach the limitation of claim 1.

Tan et al. also teach the limitation of the wireless local area network transceiver is an 802.11x transceiver (paragraph 0021), which means the wireless transceiver in the wireless VOIP telephone is also an 802.11x transceiver.

5. Claims 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tan et al. (US2004/0204084) in view of Rusch (US2003/0100308) and Raffel et al. (US Patent#6681118).

Regarding claim 3, Tan et al. and Rusch teach the limitation of claim 2.

Tan et al. also teach the limitation of the base station further comprising a network interface card (120 of Fig. 1).

But, Tan et al. and Rusch fail to teach the limitation of the base station notifies a wireless local area network when a wireless personal area network signal from the wireless handset is not detected.

Rafael et al. teach the limitation of the base station notifies a wireless local area network when a wireless personal area network signal from the wireless handset is not detected (abstract, column 5 lines 42-63).

Considering the wireless local area network taught by Tan et al. and Rusch, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the same method on a wireless local area network.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate notifying wireless local area network when a wireless handset is not detected taught by Raffel et al., in order to stop the local area network from forwarding messages.

6. Claims 5-6, 8, and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tan et al. (US2004/0204084) in view of Rusch (US2003/0100308) and Park (US Patent#6389299).

Regarding claim 10, Tan et al. teach a system for sending and receiving voice over Internet Protocol using a wireless voice over Internet Protocol telephone (abstract), comprising:

a telephone (10 of Fig. 1), the telephone comprising:

a wireless handset (300 of Fig. 1) having a wireless personal area network transceiver or a wireless local area network transceiver (paragraphs 0021-0022),
and
a base station (100 of Fig. 1) having a network interface card (120 of Fig. 1) and a wireless personal area network transceiver (200 of Fig. 1);

But, Tan et al. fail to teach the limitation of the wireless handset having both a wireless personal area network transceiver and a wireless local area network transceiver, an access point, and a

controller communicatively coupled to the base station and to the access point via a local area network.

Rusch teaches the limitation of a wireless handset having both a wireless personal area network transceiver and a wireless local area network transceiver (abstract, Fig. 1).

Park teaches the limitation of a telephone system having an access point (110 of Fig. 1), and a controller (100 of Fig. 1) communicatively coupled to the base station (101 of Fig. 1) and to the access point via a network (Figs. 1-2).

With considering teachings of Tan et al. and Rusch in using local area network connection, for the benefit of efficiently utilizing network resources, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate local area network for connection among the wireless telephone, base station, and access point when all of them are in a small ranged area.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate coupling wireless telephone with base station and access point over local area network taught by Park and handset having multiple transceivers taught by Rusch into the wireless VOIP telephone of Tan et al., in order to provide efficient and easy switchable network connection to the wireless VOIP telephone.

Regarding claims 5 and 8, Tan et al. and Rusch teach the limitations of claims 2 and 1.

But, Tan et al. and Rusch fail to teach the limitation of the wireless personal area network transceiver of the base station is an infrared transceiver and the wireless personal area network transceiver of the wireless handset is an infrared transceiver.

Park teaches the limitation of the wireless personal area network transceiver of the base station is an infrared transceiver and the wireless personal area network transceiver of the wireless handset is an infrared transceiver (abstract, Fig. 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate infrared transceivers in both base station and wireless handset taught by Park into the modified wireless VOIP telephone of Tan et al. and Rusch, in order to provide wireless connection between the base station and the wireless handset.

Regarding claim 6, Tan et al. and Rusch teach the limitation of claim 2.

But, Tan et al. and Rusch fail to teach the limitation of further comprising a phone controller, wherein the phone controller is communicatively coupled to an access point over a local area network and to the base station.

Park teaches the limitation of a wireless telephone comprising a phone controller (100 of Fig. 1), wherein the phone controller (100 of Fig. 1) is communicatively coupled to an access point (110 of Fig. 1) over a network and to the base station (101 of Fig. 1).

With considering teachings of Tan et al. and Rusch in using local area network connection, for the benefit of efficiently utilizing network resources, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate local area network for connection among the wireless telephone, base station, and access point when all of them are in a small ranged area.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate coupling wireless telephone with base station and access point over

local area network taught by Park into the modified wireless VOIP telephone of Tan et al. and Rusch, in order to provide efficient network connection to the wireless VOIP telephone.

Regarding claim 11, Tan et al., Rusch, and Park teach the limitation of claim 10.

Tan et al. also teach the limitation of the wireless local area network transceiver is an 802.11x transceiver (paragraph 0021), which means the wireless transceiver in the wireless VOIP telephone is also an 802.11x transceiver.

Regarding claim 12, Tan et al., Rusch, and Park teach the limitation of claim 10.

Tan et al. also teach the limitation of the wireless local area network transceiver of the base station is a Bluetooth transceiver (paragraph 0021), which means the wireless transceiver in the wireless VOIP telephone is also a Bluetooth transceiver

Regarding claim 13, Tan et al., Rusch, and Park teach the limitation of claim 10.

Tan et al. also teach the limitation of the local area network transceiver is an 802.11x transceiver, which means the local area network comprises an Ethernet network.

7. Claims 14-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tan et al. (US2004/0204084) in view of Park (US Patent#6389299) and Jonsson (US Patent#5915224).

Regarding claim 14, Tan et al. teach a method for a wireless handset to send and receive voice over Internet Protocol using a wireless voice over Internet Protocol telephone, comprising the

step of transmitting a communications signal over a wireless personal area network transceiver from the wireless handset to a base station (abstract, Fig. 1).

But, Tan et al. fail to teach the limitation of determining when the wireless handset is out of range of the base station; and activating a wireless local area network transceiver by the base station.

Park teaches the limitation of a wireless local area network transceiver (110 of Fig. 1), a wireless handset (111 of Fig. 1) and a base station (101 of Fig. 1).

Jonsson teaches the limitation of determining when the wireless handset is out of range of the base station and informing the network switching circuit to activate another base station (column 6 line 25 to column 7 line 6).

Considering not both base stations are activated the same time in Jonssen's teaching, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to recognize activating another network transceiver of another when the wireless handset detected out of range is in the same aspect, which makes it obvious to modify with wireless local area network and incorporate into the method of Tan et al., so that other base station can be activated to detect the wireless handset and provide service.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the system method of Park and the steps of determining if the wireless handset is out of range and activating another wireless transceiver taught by Rusch into the method of Tan et al., in order to provide continuous efficient wireless communications service.

Regarding claim 15, Tan et al., Park, and Jonsson teach the limitation of claim 14.

Park also teaches the limitation of the wireless local area network transceiver (110 of Fig. 1) is at a remote location and communicatively coupled to the base station (101 of Fig. 1) (Fig. 1).

Regarding claim 16, Tan et al., Park, and Jonsson teach the limitation of claim 14.

Tan et al. also teach the limitation of further comprising a base station (100 of Fig. 1) that comprises a wireless personal area network transceiver (200 of Fig. 1) for communicating with the wireless personal area network transceiver of the wireless handset (300 of Fig. 1) (paragraph 0021).

Regarding claim 17, Tan et al., Park, and Jonsson teach the limitation of claim 16.

Tan et al. teach the limitation of the wireless personal area network transceiver of the base station is a Bluetooth transceiver and the wireless personal area network transceiver of the wireless handset is a Bluetooth transceiver (paragraph 0021).

Regarding claim 18, Tan et al., Park, and Jonsson teach the limitation of claim 16.

Jonsson also teaches the limitation of further comprising authenticating the wireless handset by the base station (column 4 lines 16-32).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate authenticating the wireless handset by the base station taught by Jonsson into the modified method of Tan et al. and Park, in order to provide security and authorization for using the communications service.

Regarding claim 19, Tan et al., Park, and Jonsson teach the limitation of claim 18.

Tan et al. also teach the limitation of the wireless local area network transceiver is an 802.11x transceiver (paragraph 0021), which means the wireless transceiver in the wireless VOIP telephone is also an 802.11x transceiver.

Regarding claim 20, Tan et al., Park, and Jonsson teach the limitation of claim 19.

Park also teach the limitation of further comprising:

- a) receiving the communications signal over the wide area cellular network transceiver by an access point (110 of Fig. 1) coupled to the wide area cellular network; and
- b) forwarding the communications signal from the access point to a controller (100 of Fig. 1) that routes the signal to a destination.

Considering the wireless local area network taught by Tan et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the same method on a wireless local area network.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time to incorporate the communications method of Park into the modified method of Tan et al. and Jonsson, in order to provide telecommunications service with the outside networks.

Regarding claim 21, Tan et al., Park, and Jonsson teach the limitation of claim 14.

Tan et al. also teach the limitation of the communications signal comprises a voice over Internet Protocol data stream (abstract).

Regarding claim 22, Tan et al., Park and Jonsson teach the limitation of claim 14.

Tan et al. also teach the limitation of detecting when the wireless handset is within range of the base station; and establishing a communications session between the wireless handset and the base station (abstract, Fig. 1).

8. Claims 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tan et al. (US2004/0204084) in view of Park (US Patent#6389299), Jonsson (US Patent#5915224) and Akhavan (US Patent#5920815).

Regarding claim 23, Tan et al., Park and Jonsson teach the limitation of claim 22.

Tan et al., Park, and Jonsson do not expressly disclose the limitation of deactivating the wireless local area network transceiver by the base station.

However, Jonsson teaches the limitation of only one of the two base stations allows to be activated (column 6 lines 25-58).

Akhavan teaches the limitation of cordless telephone station being the default communications connection station once the wireless handset enters its range (abstract).

Considering the teachings of Jonsson and Akhavan, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the cordless telephone station being the default communications connection station and modify the telephone system of Park with deactivating the other network, in order to save power and network resource.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate making the cordless telephone station as a default station taught by Akhavan and activating only one base station taught by Jonsson into the modified method of Tan et al. and Park, in order to save power and network resources.

9. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rusch (US2003/0100308) in view of Akhavan (US Patent#5920815).

Regarding claim 28, Rusch teach the limitation of claim 27.

But, Rusch fails to teach the limitation of further comprising re-establishing the connection with the base station via a first transceiver when the wireless handset returns to being within range of the base station.

Akhavan teaches the limitation of re-establishing the connection with the base station via a first transceiver when the wireless handset returns to being within range of the base station (abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate re-establishing connection when re-entering the range of the base station taught by Akhavan into the method of Rusch, in order to save network resource.

10. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rusch (US2003/0100308) in view of Akhavan (US Patent#5920815) and Jonsson (US Patent#5915224).

Regarding claim 29, Rusch and Akhavan teach the limitation of claim 28.

But, Rusch and Akhavan fail to teach the limitation of further comprising switching power off to the second transceiver after re-establishing the connection with the base station.

Jonsson teaches the limitation of only one of the two base stations allows to be activated (column 6 lines 25-58).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate switching power off to one transceiver taught by Jonsson into the modified method of Rusch and Akhavan, in order to save power and network resource.

11. Claims 30-31 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park (US Patent#6389299) in view of Akhavan (US Patent#5920815) and Mohammed (US Patent#6922559).

Regarding claim 30, Park teaches a method for a base station (101 of Fig. 1) to facilitate communications between an associated wireless handset (111 of Fig. 1) and a local area network (10 of Fig. 1), the step comprising:

establishing a communications session between the wireless handset and the base station when the wireless handset is within range of the base station, the base station forwarding packets between the wireless handset and the local area network (Fig. 1).

But, Park fails to teach the limitation of notifying a device on the local area network when the base station loses contact with the wireless handset.

Akhavan teaches the limitation of notifying a device on the network when the base station loses contact with the wireless handset (abstract).

Mohammed teaches the limitation of wireless handset (12 of Fig. 1) telecommunicating on a wireless local area network (16 of Fig. 1).

Considering the teachings of Akhavan and Mohammed, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the main switching apparatus (100 of Fig.1) of Park to be the device that the base station notifying, so that no more message forwarding.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate notifying method of Akhavan and telecommunicating on a local area network taught by Mohammed into the method of Park, in order to efficiently utilize and save network resources such as message forwarding.

Regarding claim 31, Park, Akhavan, and Mohammed teach the limitation of claim 30.

Akhavan also teaches the limitation of the establishing step further comprises authenticating the wireless handset (column 10 lines 1-27).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate authenticating the wireless handset taught by Akhavan into the modified method of Park and Mohammed, in order to authorize and secure service.

Regarding claim 33, Park, Akhavan, and Mohammed teach the limitation of claim 30.

Mohammed also teaches the limitation of further comprises sending data necessary for authenticating the wireless handset to the local area network (abstract).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate authenticating the wireless handset taught by Mohammed into the modified method of Park and Akhavan, in order to authorize and secure service.

12. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park (US Patent#6389299) in view of Akhavan (US Patent#5920815), Mohammed (US Patent#6922559), and Tan et al. (US2004/0204084).

Art Unit: 2618

Regarding claim 32, Park, Akhavan, and Mohammed teach the limitation of claim 31.

But, Park, Akhavan, and Mohammed do not expressly disclose the limitation of the communications session is a Bluetooth compatible session.

Tan et al. teach the limitation of the communications session between a handset and a main telephone is a Bluetooth compatible session (paragraph 0021).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Bluetooth communications session taught by Tan et al. into the modified method of Park, Akhavan, and Mohammed, in order to provide wireless personal area network service.

Conclusion

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zhiyu Lu whose telephone number is (571) 272-2837. The examiner can normally be reached on Weekdays: 9AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay Maung can be reached on (571)272-7882. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/600,084
Art Unit: 2618

Page 19

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Zhiyu Lu *ZL*
February 24, 2006

NLM
NAY MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER